SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. V, No. 18 | P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 | October 15, 1975

Cancer Budget Survives First Serious Congressional Attack

With the kind of herd instinct and irrational rhetoric that characterized defense budget debates at the height of the Cold War, the Senate has beaten down an attempt to trim the growth of spending on cancer and heart research and redistribute some of the savings to less-favored fields of medical research.

The attempt was the first serious effort in Congress to contain the privileged position that cancer research holds in the National Institutes of Health as a result of that blank-check legislation known as the National Cancer Act of 1971. (The 1972 law that sought to do the same for heart disease has, so far, failed to take off with similar financial success, probably because heart ailments are not quite as agonizing and mysterious as cancer).

The failure of the Senate attempt signals that cancer research holds a firm place on the select list of political immunes, and that growth of the overall biomedical research budget is the only feasible solution to the financial difficulties that afflict the non-cancer parts of NIH. With Congress and the Ford Administration assailing each other about fiscal responsibility, the odds for that happening are probably not too good. But biomedical politics occupy a special compartment on the national scene, and it may just be that the boom in cancer research has created such serious distortions in NIH priorities that, miraculously, a new fiscal breakthrough for biomedical spending may be in the offing.

The attempt to reduce the growth of spending for cancer research was led by Senators Cranston (D-Calif.) and Nelson (D-Wisc.) in the course of a debate September 26 on the appropriations bill for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

Equipped with extensive and illuminating statistics about the financial history of NIH since passage of the

(Continued on Page 2)

Cancer's Domination of NIH Budget

Percentage Change
(Current and Constant Dollars)
In Funding Levels of National Institutes of Health
1970-75

	1970 appropriation (includes training)	1975 appropriation (does not include training, authority not yet enacted)	Percent increase	
			Current dollars	Constant dollars
Cancer	182	669	280	186
Heart	159	303	104	52
Dental	29	44	71	28
Arthritis	134	161	29	—4
Neurology	97	129	47	10
Allergy	94	110	27	—5
General Med. Sci.	151	135	24	—7
Child Health and Dev.	72	116	97	47
Eye	24	39	83	38
Environ. Health	17	32	97	52
Aging	0	14		
Research Resources	132	128	—4	—28
Total NIH	1,092	1,887	86	40
Total (excluding cancer and heart)	750	908	11	—13

In Brief

Emilio Q. Daddario's directorship of the Congressional Office of Technology Assessment is a subject of increased grumbling among members of Congress, OTA staffers, and OTA's own advisory council. It was generally considered to be a nice nostalgic touch when the former Connecticut Congressman, father of the OTA legislation, was appointed to be the first director. But his critics say he is ill-equipped to pioneer and run the multi-million dollar operation. Specifics are hard to come by, but Daddario is frequently accused of indecisiveness, abrupt countermanding of agreed-on decisions, and failure to keep up good relations with Congressional powers that count.

Sweden's Lund University has a new addition to its curriculum, possibly a first for the academic world: An Introductory Course in Intelligence that will range from the capture of Adolph Eichmann to comparisons of US, Soviet, and Swedish intelligence programs. Taught by Stefan Dedijer, who has written extensively on science-policy affairs, the course will also cover "spying in science" and business intelligence and security.

Robert I. Levy, a researcher and administrator at the National Heart and Lung Institute since 1963, has been appointed director, succeeding Theodore Cooper, the newly appointed Assistant Secretary of HEW for Health. Prior to Levy's appointment, the post was filled on an acting basis by Robert Ringler, who returns to the job of Deputy Director.

Under prodding from Senator Kennedy, the National Science Board of the National Science Foundation has established a Committee on Women and Minorities in Science, to be chaired by NSB member Jewel Plummer Cobb, dean of Connecticut College.

Postscript to 1971 Cancer Debate : Spending to No Effect

When the National Cancer Act of 1971 was debated in Congress, critics argued that scientific understanding of the mechanisms of cancer was insufficient to support a so-called "war" on the disease.

Prominent among them was James Watson, the Nobel laureate director of the Cold Spring Harbor Laboratories, who told a House subcommittee that "By careful public relations, the impression can be created that we are onto something hot." Warning about the possible diversion of funds into ineffective "treatment" programs, Watson added, "I see no rational alternative to many more years of firm support to the better of our scientists who work on the problems that either directly or indirectly bear on cancer."

The budgetary issue of treatment versus research is a complex one, and Watson himself has lately acknowledged that funds for cancer-related basic research have sizeably increased along with new funds for treatment programs.

But as a footnote to that long ago expression of concern, it is worth noting a passage from the August meeting of the President's Cancer Panel. Appearing before the group, Vincent DeVitta, director of the National Cancer Institute's Division of Cancer Treatment, remarked:

"We have a long way to go in lung cancer, but the major reason for putting more monies in that area was not because there were scientific leads in therapy to pursue; there are not many at this point in time, but because it is such a tremendous social problem. It is the commonest male killer in this country."

NCI Thrives While Most of NIH Falters

(Continued from Page 1)

Cancer Act and the companion National Heart, Blood Vessel, Lung and Blood Act of 1972, the two Senators argued that most of NIH's other programs have been stagnating while cancer, and, to a lesser extent, heart research have been booming.

As a step toward correcting this, they proposed that both cancer and heart spending should go up, as provided for in a House-passed bill that called for increases of $34 million and $26 million, respectively, for the National Cancer Institute and the National Heart Institute. But, they argued, the Senate should reject a recommendation of its own Appropriations Committee to exceed the House figures by $100 million and $50 million for the institutes.

From the $150 million thus "saved," they proposed, $50 million should be redistributed to the other NIH institutes. Their scheme not only had the virute of raising cancer and heart spending—though not as much as the House had proposed—but it would also help the other institutes and cut back on spending. That last item was designed as a lure for fiscal conservatives, and it won the support of Senator Muskie (D-Maine), who, as chairman of the Senate Budget Committee, is trying to persuade his colleagues that Congress must really adhere to its new system of working within overall budget ceilings.

In support of their case, Cranston and Nelson cited the following:

- Between fiscal years 1970 and 1975, appropriations for NCI rose 280 per cent, and for NHI they rose 104 per cent; meanwhile, funds for NIH's other research components rose by 11 per cent.
- Adjusting the dollars for inflation, NCI grew by 186 per cent and NHI by 52 per cent; the other institutes dropped by 13 per cent.
- In the present fiscal year, the Cancer and Heart Institutes are receiving 51 per cent of the total NIH budget; in 1970, they received 31 per cent.
- In funding of approved grant applications, the figure for NCI is 62 per cent, compared with 53 per cent for the rest of NIH.

(Continued on Page 3)

Science & Government Report © 1975

Contributing Editors
Colin Norman, Pamela Moore

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Circulation Manager
Alice Anne Freund

Independently published by *Science & Government Report,* Inc., 22 times per year. Annual subscription: Institutions, $65 (two years, $120); individuals, $44 (two years, $75). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms.

Ex-NIH Directors Hit Boom in Cancer Funds

(Continued from Page 2)

Cranston stated that he recognized that cancer and heart research "are vital programs which must receive very substantial support, and I support very substantial appropriations for them. However, I believe that the appropriation of substantial additional funds for cancer research—and to a lesser degree, heart and lung research—is, and has been, at the expense of adequate support for research in other areas, especially basic biomedical research. In addition, " Cranston argued, "I think there is much evidence that the benefits of expanded basic research programs at the other NIH institutes will accrue to the understanding and conquest of cancer and heart disease."

Cranston then quoted several biomedical research administrators in support of his case. Reading from a letter by James Shannon, who directed NIH from 1955 to 1968—the big boom period for federal support of health-related research—Cranston cited Shannon's concern about imbalance in NIH's overall program. There has been a lack, Shannon wrote, of "An appreciation that all the programs of NIH, particularly those of heart and cancer, have been through a turbulent 5-year period. In consequence, there is merit, indeed high merit, in a pause in program expansion in order to reassess the basic strategy of these endeavors, to enquire into the reasonableness of attaining their objectives, and in these regards, the real needs for further program diversification."

Shannon made it clear that he felt that the issue was strategy, rather than more or less money, and that he favored the Cranston-Nelson amendment only if it served to encourage a re-examination of NIH programs and planning.

Next cited was a statement from another ex-NIH director, Robert Q. Marston, who headed the organization when the expanded cancer and heart programs were adopted.

"I support the need to restore balance to funding among NIH institutes and activities and to redistribute proposed increases from the Cancer and Heart institutes to other institutes," Marston wrote.

"It is important to remember," he continued, "that dollars spent in support of science must be spent for sound science. Support of bad science can be very harmful because someone has to eventually undo the bad science and this can be a very costly and wasteful process.

"At the time of the enactment of the Conquest of Cancer Act, I expressed great concern that the push in the cancer program not be at the expense of support for other institutes.

"I feared," Marston added, "that the push on cancer would lead to over-promises and unjustified hopes and misunderstanding of what a crash program can in fact achieve. I think much of my apprehension has now been justified, and my concerns continue today."

Also quoted by Cranston were statements of support from Philip Lee, assistant secretary for health at HEW

(Continued on Page 4)

NIH Is up to Budget Ceiling

Hovering around the issue of expanded support for biomedical research outside of cancer and heart research is the new and untried system of Congress agreeing upon an overall spending ceiling and then adjusting its appropriations to remain within that figure.

The system, which is just now being put into operation, inevitably points toward a conflict between the powerful chairmen of the appropriations subcommittees and the newly created Congressional Budget committees, which are responsible for arriving at the ceiling figure.

The agreed upon Congressional ceiling for NIH is $2.1 billion, compared to an Administration request for $1.8 billion. The House voted out a figure of $2.15 billion, and the Senate came out with $2.166 billion. If the ceiling system is to mean anything, something is going to have to give, even though the amounts involved are relatively small.

At present there are so many uncertainties about the working of the budget system that it is impossible to assess whether there is any reality to attempts to beef up the other parts of NIH. Political sentiment for that goal could probably be whipped up through further assaults on the domination that cancer and heart research hold over NIH programs. Congressmen like medical research, though few of them follow it carefully. In addition, the case for helping the other institutes is a pretty persuasive one, as indicated by 19 Senators allying themselves with the Cranston-Nelson effort to trim back on cancer and heart programs so as to aid other fields of biomedical research. But cancer and heart research have demonstrated themselves to be immune to political assault, thus leaving the question of where's the money to come from if they are untouchable and the ceiling remains intact.

Magnuson: Critics Are Disappointed Grant Seekers

(Continued from Page 3)

from 1965-68, who is now director of the health policy program at the University of California San Francisco Medical School; Daniel Koshland, chairman of the biochemistry department, UC Berkeley, and William Rutter, chairman of biochemistry and biophysics, at the San Francisco Medical School.

And there was also a statement, anonymously reported, from "a distinguished scientist who reviews scientific abstracts locally for a wide variety of biomedical research projects," to wit:

"I am struck by how much junk is being done in the highly funded research areas, heart and cancer, much of which is scientifically poor, imprecise, and inadequate; and by how much good quality basic research in other areas is not being funded."

First off in opposition to the Cranston-Nelson amendment was Senator Magnuson (D-Wash.), whose legislative link to cancer research dates to 1937, when, as a freshman in the House, he introduced the bill that led to the creation of the National Cancer Institute. The Senator, now 72, has for the past 20 years looked after his offspring as chairman of the appropriations subcommittee that votes money for NIH. And, as he made it plain in his irascible manner, he was in no mood to have it tinkered with by two relative newcomers.

"Senators may listen to those feuds going on out at NIH," Magnuson said, "I know about them pretty well; I have been handling this appropriations account for many years. I do not blame them for sticking up for their own organizations . . . Believe me, 20 million people in the United States who have been affected directly or indirectly care about cancer. And if we could poll the American people right now, and ask them, 'What headline would you like to see in your morning paper when you wake up tomorrow?' most or all of them would answer four words: 'Cure for Cancer Found.'

"Maybe this is too much," Magnuson continued, "but I could get 500 doctors for the ones the Senator (Cranston) could get who would talk the other way in support of cancer and heart programs . . . I do not particularly care about hearing Shannon again. I have listened to him for 15 years . . . Even if it (the appropriation) is a little too much, I am not going to be one who is going to stand here and provide too little when we are making some progress. . . ."

Magnuson also declared, "I know something about some of the people who come down there (to his appropriations subcommittee) and want to argue about priorities, but they are usually people who applied for grants and did not get them.

"But," he conceded, "good constructive criticism is good and we encourage it."

As for the sponsors of the amendment, the kindest thought he could offer was that they had been misled by selfish interests. Why, he demanded, had they not brought their amendment before his subcommittee? The answer, known full well to Magnuson and all others present, was that the sponsors did not want their amendment obliterated in the relative privacy of an appropriations hearing room; rather, they wanted to raise the amendment before the entire Senate so that after the inevitable defeat occurred, the issue would at least have been planted in their colleagues' minds.

Next came Senator Brooke (R-Mass.), who took the position that Magnuson is the Senate's authority on cancer research and, therefore, the bill should go through untouched.

"When he speaks emotionally," Brooke said of Magnuson, "it is because he knows exactly what the deliberations have covered, including the establishment of priorities and the commitment of money for important basic research."

Then came Senator Bayh (D-Ind.), who suggested that cancer and heart funding should remain intact, and funds for other fields of research should be increased. Since the formulation lacked any reality as far as the matter before the Senate was concerned, the Bayh argument stirred no interest.

Senator Kennedy (D-Mass.) observed that since the priority issue will be covered in the report of the President's Biomedical Research Panel, which is due in April, the Senate ought to go along with the present bill and re-examine the matter after ther report is out.

Senator Humphrey (D-Minn.) took off on a rhetorical binge that included such illuminants as, "This is not any time to put up the flag of surrender or truce, and it is surely not any time to just mark time and stop our forward progress."

When the amendment came to a vote, it was defeated, 62-19.

About the only bright spot in this squalid legislative episode is that Magnuson said he would consider supplemental funds for the other NIH institutes later this month, and that the issue of biomedical research priorities has at least had an airing.

Against this background, the forthcoming report of the Biomedical Research Panel is likely to be very important in biomedical research politics. —DSG

Rickover Assails DoD Independent Research

The Pentagon's controversial independent research and development program (IR&D), a $1-billion a year subsidy to defense contractors for support of their own research activities, has been subjected to a devastating critique by a longtime participant in the inner workings of the military-industrial complex.

In testimony last month before a Senate Armed Services subcommittee, Admiral Hyman G. Rickover, director of the Navy's nuclear propulsion program, denounced IR&D expenditures as ill-founded, poorly controlled, and a waste of money. He recommended that Congress eliminate the subsidy completely, and put the money into something more useful.

Rickover's attack, delivered on the final day of hearings on the IR&D program, contrasts sharply with an earlier report by the General Accounting Office, which offered a mild endorsement of the IR&D program (SGR Vol. V, No. 17). His testimony has already been given wide publicity by Senator William Proxmire (D-Wisc.), who tried two years ago to cut IR&D expenditures, but postponed a renewed assault pending publication of the GAO report. Though Proxmire is too late to delete funds from the Defense authorizations bill this year, he is expected to return to the attack when the Pentagon's FY 1977 budget comes before Congress.

The IR&D program is essentially an arrangement by which defense contractors charge off part of their own research and development budgets as overhead on a government contract, even though the research may have no relevance to that contract. DoD defends the arrangement as a means by which defense contractors can keep abreast of technological developments outside the scope of their present contracts, so that they will be in a competitive position to bid for future government work.

Rickover took issue, however, with virtually every justification put forward by DoD and military contractors for the continuation of IR&D funding. For example, argument that the IR&D program helps promote competition in the defense industry and broadens the industrial base for defense needs is false, he suggested. Since the largest defense contractors carry off the lion's share of IR&D funds, the arrangement simply helps them maintain their dominance in the industry. As for the claim that IR&D has led to scores of useful developments, Rickover noted that although DoD has drafted a list of examples of innovations from the IR&D program, "I could name hundreds of actual, not claimed, improvements in nuclear plant technology from direct Navy- or AEC-funded research. The issue is not whether discoveries have been made under IR&D, but whether the Defense Department can afford to pay a billion dollars annually for contractors to spend as they see fit, in hopes that our defense will at some future unspecified date benefit directly or indirectly from such expenditures."

A few years ago, in response to growing unease about the IR&D program, Congress passed a bill designed to limit the research and development supported by the IR&D program to projects which have potential military application. But Rickover labelled those restrictions as "largely cosmetic," citing examples such as "development of sewage treatment systems for coin-operated laundries; energy studies for heating high-rise buildings; and the development of home appliances" which have been allowed to DoD contract managers.

Rickover also took exception to the arrangement by which the contractors retain patent and royalty rights to inventions developed under IR&D funding. He told the committee, for example, of a contractor who developed at government expense and patented an automatic welding machine which was then marketed to defense contractors and to government installations. "As it turned out," Rickover said, "the government paid not only for developing the invention but also for royalties for using it on government work."

Rickover's prescription for reforming the IR&D program is to eliminate it entirely and to put those few IR&D projects which may be worth the cost under direct contract. Because of his long experience with the defense industry, Rickover's analysis of the situation will carry considerable weight in the upcoming Congressional debate on IR&D.—CN

National Science Board Appointment

Charles P. Slichter, professor of physics at the University of Illinois, has been appointed to the National Science Board. He succeeds Hubert Heffner, of Stanford University, who died April 1.

Statement of Ownership, Management and Circulation

Science & Government Report, published 22 times per year at 3736 Kanawha St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20015; publisher and editor, Daniel S. Greenberg, (same address); Stockholders owning or holding one percent or more of stock, Daniel S. Greenberg (same address). Extent and nature of circulation: Average number copies each issue during preceding 12 months/actual number of copies of single issue published nearest to filing data (Oct. 1, 1975): total no. of copies printed 2000/2000; paid circulation through dealers and carriers, street vendors and counter sales: 0/0; mail subscriptions: 1655/1784; free distribution by mail, carrier, or other means: 38/35; copies distributed to news agents but not sold: 0/0; total distribution, 1693/1819; office use, left over, unaccounted, spoiled after printing: 307/181; total 2000/2000.

Pastore Retirement Further Erodes Joint Atomic Committee

A further decline in the influence of the powerful Joint Committee on Atomic Energy (JCAE) can be anticipated as a result of the decision of Sen. John O. Pastore (D-R.I.) not to seek reelection to a fifth term in the Senate. His retirement could mean that virtually every senior Democratic Senator on the JCAE will be leaving Congress at the end of this term.

Pastore, who is an extremely skilled orator and legislator, is now chairman of the JCAE, and for many years he has shrewdly steered nuclear energy legislation through the Senate. He also played an influential role in nuclear arms limitation matters in the early 1960s by shepherding the partial test ban treaty and the nuclear non-proliferation treaty through the skeptical JCAE and the Senate. He successfully led the opposition to a move earlier this year to delay the controversial liquid metal fast breeder reactor program. In short, his reign as chairman of the JCAE has been extremely productive.

His departure throws wide open the question of who will get the JCAE chairmanship when it rotates back to the Senate. The next ranking Democratic Senator is Henry Jackson (D-Wash.), but he is up for reelection next year and will have to relinquish his seat if he decides to remain a Presidential candidate. After him comes Sen. Stuart Symington (D-Mo.), but he has already announced that he will also be retiring from the Senate next year. The next in line is Sen. Joseph Montoya (D-N.M.), who is also up for reelection and is reportedly facing a strong challenge in the primaries.

The JCAE, which is already suffering from the retirement this year of former Reps. Chet Holifield and Craig Hosmer, and from the influx of several younger and more skeptical members of Congress, is clearly going to be a radically changed committee.

NSF Hits (Lightly) at Critics

In response to periodic smacks from wiseacre Congressmen who reap publicity by ridiculing the titles of some of its research projects, the National Science Foundation has uncharacteristically counter-attacked with a pamphlet called "A Look Behind Research Grant Titles."

Consisting of Congressional testimony by NSF Director H. Guyford Stever and a short essay by Isaac Asimov (taken from an NSF-supported book, *The Greatest Adventure,* Rockefeller University Press), the 9-page rejoinder does not go very far behind research grant titles; nor does it name any of NSF's legislative tormentors, of whom Senator Proxmire (D-Wisc.) is perhaps the star performer.

In fact, the only item germane to the title is an explanation that in mathematics, the word "game" has a meaning different from its commonplace usage. Otherwise, the pamphlet consists of a series of statements concerning frequently unanticipated payoffs from basic research.

Mild though it may be in comparison to the nasty attacks that the Foundation has suffered, the pamphlet represents a departure from the previous policy of suffering in silence.

Copies were recently sent to science writers and editors under a covering letter from Jack Renirie, NSF's chief of public information. Additional copies may be obtained by writing to him at NSF, 1800 G St. Nw., Washington, DC 20550.

In Print

The following new publications are available from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office, Wash., D.C. 20402 (783-3238). Refer to the publication by stock number when ordering. Prices are subject to change.

National Patterns of R&D Resources: Funds and Manpower in the United States, 1953-1975. Stock Number 038-000-00223. Price: $1.15.

R&D Activities of Independent Nonprofit Institutions, 1973. Stock Number 038-000-00224. Price: $1.90.

Reviews of Data on Science Resources, No. 23, "R&D Expenditures of State Public Institutions, Fiscal Year 1973." Stock Number 038-000-00222. Price: $0.35.

The 1972 Scientist and Engineer Population Redefined. Vol. 1. Demographic, Educational, and Professional Characteristics. Stock Number 038-000-00228. Price: $3.70.

Characteristics of Doctoral Scientists and Engineers in the United States, 1973. Stock Number 038-000-00229-5. Price: $1.15.

The above list is taken from the monthly *NSF Bulletin,* which is a valuable source of information on the Foundation's programs, application deadlines, staff changes, and so forth. Subscriptions available without charge from Publications Resource Office, National Science Foundation, Washington, DC 20550.

Senate Study Urges Solar Contracts for Small Firms

In a report which should serve to enrich the jurisdictional confusion on energy matters in the Senate, the Senate Select Committee on Small Business has delivered an indictment of the Administration's solar energy policies.

The Committee notes that successive Administrations have ignored a number of studies which have unanimously urged that research on solar energy be stepped up, and solar technology has therefore suffered from "20 years of abysmally inadequate funding." As long ago as 1952, for example, a Presidential commission recommended that the nation should undertake "aggressive research in the whole field of solar energy," and predicted that such an effort could result in 10 per cent of total energy needs in 1975 being met by solar power. Complaints that the Administration has been dragging its feet on the development of solar energy are, of course, standard fare—particularly in speeches on Capitol Hill, where support for the solar energy program is seen as a political plus. But the Committee at least breaks some new ground by offering a sharp criticism of the Administration's alleged practice of handing out solar energy grants to big corporations and universities, instead of to small business concerns.

"Federal policy has virtually ignored the contributions of small business to solar energy research and development," the committee states. "Little or no money has been available from the Federal Government for small entrepreneurs and investors. In fact, it appears that most Federal expenditures in solar energy R&D have been concentrated among a handful of corporate giants and large universities."

That situation is particularly unjust, the Committee argues, because until the federal government began to spend money on solar R&D a couple of years ago, small businesses were the only concerns active in the field. Government neglect of solar energy had "left solar energy up to the small business pioneers and individual innovators who, acting on their own initiative, with virtually no government support, were responsible for almost all of the solar energy research, development and demonstration work that occurred in this country up to 1973," the Committee suggests.

As an example of the problems faced by small businesses in dealing with the federal government, the Committee cites the case of a small business concern whose proposal to the National Science Foundation was turned down. The president of the company then offered the idea to the University of Utah "in order to test his theory that the NSF prefers to deal with the universities rather than small research companies." The university submitted the proposal as its own, and received a grant to do the work, the committee claims.

Be that as it may, ERDA is not deaf to the requests for small business companies to share in the solar energy research effort. On September 19, for example, ERDA announced in *Commerce Business Daily* the availability of contracts "to support the national solar heating and cooling demonstration program," and suggested that 50 per cent of the awards would go to small business concerns.

But that is not likely to satisfy the Committee, for it suggested in the report that "the agencies and the Congress should consider—and the Committee is now investigating—the feasibility of a 70 per cent small business set-aside in the heating and cooling demonstration program."

(Copies of the report, "The Role of Small Business in Solar Energy Research, Development and Demonstration," are available from the Senate Select Committee on Small Business, US Senate, Washington, DC)

Director Named for Allergy Institute

Richard Krause, an immunologist who is a professor at Rockefeller University, has been appointed director of the NIH National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases, effective November 1. Krause succeeds Dorland J. Davis, who retired in August. John Seal, scientific director of the Institute, has been serving since then as acting director.

Subscription Form

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

☐ Renew my subscription ☐ Check enclosed
☐ Enter my subscription ☐ Please bill

Institutional subscribers: one year, $65 ☐; two years, $120 ☐
Individual subscribers: one year, $44 ☐; two years, $75 ☐

(Overseas airmail, $17.50 per year additional.)

Name_____

Address_____

_____ Zip

House Cuts Production Funds for Gas Weapons

For the second straight year, the House has dealt a major blow to the Army's irrespressible binary chemical weapons program by deleting funds for production of the weapons from the Defense budget. But Congressional supporters of the Pentagon's chemical warfare fantasies have again managed to protect the binary program from total destruction, and it can be assumed that we haven't heard the last of it.

The House action was the work of the House Appropriations Committee, which in the past has been a key supporter of the binary program. The Committee turned down the Pentagon's request for $8.8 million to begin setting up a production line for binary weapons at the Pine Bluff Arsenal in Arkansas, and instead it directed that the money should be spent on defensive chemical warfare equipment such as protective clothing for use in training in Europe.

The measure was passed by the House without opposition late last month, as part of the Defense Appropriations bill. Though the Senate Appropriations Committee hasn't yet reported out its version of the bill, it is expected to follow the House's lead on the binary program.

The Pentagon was similarly rebuffed by Congress last year, when it asked for $5.8 million to set up a binary production line. It wanted the money, it said, to begin producing binary weapons in 1977, and eventually it hoped to replace existing chemical weapons stockpiles with binaries. The cost of such a program has independently been estimated at $1-2 billion.

Though Congress turned down the request for production funds last year, it kept several million dollars in the budget for R&D on binaries, and that's exactly what has happened again this year. At one stage, however, opponents of the program came very close to deleting the R&D funds as well.

A provision in the Senate version of the 1976 defense authorization bill, sponsored by Sen. Gary Hart (D-Colo.) and Sen. Thomas McIntyre (D-N.H.), would have removed funds for every part of the binary program, and forbidden any research, development and testing of binaries, except under explicit Presidential order. The provision was deleted in conference committee at the insistence of chemical weapons advocates on the House Armed Services Committee, however, and it was replaced by language allowing $9.7 million to be spent on binary R&D and on pre-production work at Pine Bluff. The House Appropriations Committee bill would allow R&D work to proceed, but it forbids preproduction work.

One factor which caused the House Appropriations Committee to turn down the request for binary production was the suggestion that if the United States embarks on a large new chemical weapons program it would wreck the chances of negotiating a chemical disarmament treaty at negotiations which are taking place in Geneva under UN auspices. The Appropriations Committee report warned, however, that "if no progress is made in these negotiations at the time we are to consider the Fiscal year 1977 Defense Budget, the committee may have to reappraise its position on this overall matter."

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

-00006 99/99
XEROX UNIV MICROFILMS
300 N ZEEB RD
ANN ARBOR MI 48106